**Dual Credit Workgroup**

**Fiscal Subcommittee**

Thursday, August 14, 2014

1:00pm – 3:00pm

ESD 113

**Meeting Notes**

All meeting materials can be found on the workgroup wiki:

<http://wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com/Meeting+Materials>

**Attendees:**

Randy Spaulding, Noreen Light, Mike Hubert, Tim Stetter, Lucas Rucks, Tyerall Berry, Jessica Dempsey, Derek Konshuk, Jane Sherman, Teri Pablo, Terri Colbert, Rep. Chris Reykdal, Scott Copeland, Nick Lutes, Melinda Eckerman, Becky McLean, T.J. Kelly; phone in – Linda Fossen, Barb Papke, Ben Meredith

**Purpose of the meeting:** Continue discussion of fiscal options and rank options to be forwarded to the Washington Student Achievement Council.

**Summary of policy and funding proposals** was distributed. (Available [online](http://wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com/Meeting+Materials).)

**Review of policy items** on which the group has achieved consensus.

* Develop an integrated dual credit system;
* Increase availability of dual credit programs in high school;
* Decrease the opportunity gap by increasing the number of low income and under-represented minority students with access to these programs;
* Improve high school graduation and college continuation rates;
* Reduce the time students take to complete a postsecondary degree or certificate; and
* Remove barriers to participation both for schools and for students.

**Common ground on funding**:

* Reduce cost to students and families
* Keep funding “whole.” That is, make distribution of funding equitable to both K-12 and higher education partners.
* Will make every effort to achieve consensus on funding recommendations.

**Proposed statutory changes**:

* Access: Expand high School-based college courses to 9th and 10th grade students.
* Quality: Ensure that high school-based college courses meet quality standards consistent with National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) criteria.
* Funding: Improve equity in funding both high school-based and college-based programs, to incent enrollment in dual credit programs and to reduce cost to students and families.

Discussion:

* Reword quality statement to clarify that the quality standards for high school-based college courses will be developed in state, informed by national models such as [NACEP](http://www.nacep.org/).
* Concern about CTE courses fitting the same list of standards as academic courses.
* Change to include Western and UW in College in the High School and Running Start.
* Quality statement about overall HS experience. Can’t overload the student by putting them in a “fluff” class to fill the day. All classes are meaningful and contribute to the student’s HS experience.

**Funding Options**

**Proposed Option A** (funding through K-12):

* (Part 1) Fund high school-based college course completion programs, using an equitable split of the K-12 basic education appropriation (BEA) between the high school and the college.

Note: Under current model the highest performing students must pay to earn college credit.

* (Part 2) Recommend an enhancement to K-12 basic education appropriation to ensure K12 and postsecondary costs are recognized and eliminate or reduce tuition and fees for high school based college course completion programs. Enhancement may also be used to help students defer expenses for fees, books, and transportation for Running Start courses. $30-50M

Note: Adding an enhancement to basic education requires a change to the prototypical school model.

**Discussion of Option A:**

Part 1 could work without Part 2; Part 2 doesn’t work without Part 1.

* Part 1 – BEA split for high school-based college courses. This would be under the Running Start umbrella for statutory language. Purpose is to eliminate tuition and fees.

Delete note about highest achieving students.

93/7 split stays for Running Start (college-based courses), need to determine appropriate split for College in the High School (high school-based courses).

* Part 2 is for college-based courses and could be used for fees, books, transportation, etc. Splitting the BEA does not require an enhancement.

$30-50M, based on number of courses enrolled in (2013-14) at $200 - $350/course. $350 was based on UW in the High School current rate (amount paid by student), $200 was roughly the Everett Community College rate (amount paid by student).

Included assumption of 20% growth factor. Most in the room believe that growth will be higher than 20%.

This option is tied to BEA, so the amount per student will increase as the BEA increases.

* In the model that includes the enhancement, remove the disincentive for HS to offer additional dual credit courses. Currently, if HE is receiving 20% for one course, the HS will lose money if they offer additional dual credit courses in the day.
* Concern that HS would strongly advise students to take a dual credit course beyond the full day (e.g. 7th period) so that the HS would still receive the 1.0 and the HE would get the .2
* HS would receive full 1.0 FTE; HE would receive a percent of FTE per course. HS continues to receive the full FTE.
* RS rate includes 7% to K-12, which is essentially what it costs salary benefits, etc. to fund RS, alternative and dropout programs. If we want to build the rate for RS alone (not the other programs), would need to adjust in budget.
* Enhancement would be on a per course basis.
* Could propose a split without the enhancement. 30-40% of BEA going to HE. Adding enhancement takes out the disincentive for HS to replace regular course slots with dual credit courses.
* If this moves forward, challenge for OSPI to calculate funding for this. 1.2 would be given to HS and HS would distribute funds to HE? Students would be reported for BEA and then also reported for enhanced dollars.

**Proposed Option B (funding through higher ed):**

* Fund College in the High School model through higher education appropriation and eliminate or reduce tuition and fees. Clarify that Running Start is a college-based model. $9-15M

**Discussion of Option B:**

* K-12 keeps current funding, HE gets more funding.
* Funding for high school-based courses only.
* Request additional funds through proviso. K12 keeps FTE based on their reported enrollment. HE reports and gets their HE appropriation. No mechanism to pay for books, transportation or other costs for RS. Difficulty in planning exactly how many courses and students a college would serve for the next biennium. Would be in each individual college budget. No tuition charged. Eliminate RS in HS. No impact on RS.

**Proposed Option C (funding through higher ed):**

* Require public institutions to waive tuition and fees for high school based college courses offered to low income students (students eligible for free or reduced priced meals). $2-4M Note: May create a disincentive to serving low-income students.

**Discussion of Option C:**

No one likes this option. After 8th grade, students don’t want to declare as FRPL. Current RS language is permissive about waivers for low-income. This would be mandated. Strong disincentive to serve low-income districts.

**General Discussion:**

* Purpose is to increase dual credit; either option A or B will dramatically increase participation of low-income students.
* Tech Prep – right now, essentially direct transcription model. Would include CTE in both models – college-based and high school-based. Enhanced model would not replace current 1.6 enhancement for CTE.
* Including CTE in CHS requires statutory change. Look at current RS statute and how CTE is included. Fixed amount that wouldn’t go up. Not necessarily funded.
* Eliminate statute that says colleges could charge 10% of tuition.
* Concern: any reduction in funding could impact quality, for example through a decrease in professional development.
* State subsidy has been cut, what is incentive for HE to offer courses in HS? Will this make sense, fiscally?
* Current RS statute allows students to be counted for HE enrollment target. CHS does not.
* CHS students have option in UW in HS to register for credit or not. In this model, will all students in the dual credit class earn credit?

**Consensus:**

**Option A with both parts – best option by far;**

**Option B – back up plan; Option C – off the table.**

**Next Steps:**

* Randy will draft recommendation and present to the Council on August 21.
* **Workgroup participants are encouraged to attend the Washington Student Achievement Council meeting, August 21, 9:00am – 3:45, UW-T, Phillip Hall, Milgard Assembly Room.**
* After the Council meeting, draft legislation will be distributed to workgroup members for feedback.

**Next meeting of the full Dual Credit Workgroup:**

Friday, September 26, 12:30 – 3:30, same location

Focus on credit by exam (AP, IB, Cambridge) policies

We hope to see you here, in person, but if that isn’t convenient for you, you may call in.

Toll-Free Number: (800) 511-7983, Access Code: 4028173#

**Questions?** Contact Noreen Light, 360.753.7811 or [NoreenL@wsac.wa.gov](mailto:NoreenL@wsac.wa.gov)